Call to Order: Chair Melissa Broeckelman-Post called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Approval of the Minutes: August 25, 2021/September 8, 2021: Hearing no corrections, the minutes were approved as submitted.

Opening Remarks – Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Chair
Chair Broeckelman-Post welcomed Rector Jimmy Hazel.

Rector Hazel made opening remarks. He noted how good it was to see people back on campus this year, and just how different last year was for everyone. He expressed thanks on behalf of the Board of Visitors to the Faculty Senate and all faculty for everything they did to get back to campus. He stated that the primary order of business at the July Board meeting the presidential evaluation, and expressed appreciation for the input he got from Shannon Davis, outgoing Faculty Senate chair, and Melissa Broeckelman-Post, current Faculty Senate chair. Also at the July meeting, President Washington’s 2021-2022 goals were reviewed and approved – they are part of the records from that meeting. Goals included reviewing the idea of possible tuition remission for dependents of staff and faculty members and improving staff and faculty salaries (a clear priority of President Washington, who has raised the issue at every Board meeting). There was also discussion of the campus Master Plan (which will be completed in October), another capital campaign (which Rector Hazel thinks should be a billion-dollar campaign), and a new branding campaign (“The Secret is Out”) as Mason approaches its 50th anniversary next year. Rector Hazel stated that the university is in a very strong position: admissions are up, research is up, and rankings in various periodicals are up. He reiterated priorities around faculty/staff salaries and dependent tuition, thanked the Senate again, and opened the floor to questions.

A question was raised about whether dependent tuition benefits were possible given state laws. Rector Hazel indicated that part of the work to be done was to advocate for changes in Virginia code to address that issue. He expressed hope for a better chance to secure such changes, given that more representatives from Northern Virginia are now in leadership positions.

A senator expressed appreciation for the aggressive stance the university has taken with regard to COVID safety (mandated vaccines and indoor masking), and then asked whether Mason would commit to paying “prevailing wages” for construction and other workers who were working on Arlington campus projects. Rector Hazel indicated that the issue had not yet come up at the Board level, but he is happy to ask the question and have discussion about it.

No further questions were raised, and Rector Hazel concluded by remembering growing up near Mason’s campus and how exciting it was to see the university now approaching its 50th anniversary.
IV. Committee Reports
A. Senate Standing Committees

Executive Committee – Melissa Broeckelman-Post

- President and Mrs. Washington are hosting a reception for senators at the Mathy House this evening at 5:30. The same masking and Health Check protocols that apply for campus are in place.
- Senate Coffee Chat (on Zoom) Friday, Sept. 24, 2021, 9:30 am
  https://gmu.zoom.us/j/91891864102?pwd=SHpOQ3kb3FOV5aRmTRGxDMRk1zd09
- President Washington met with the Executive Committee to discuss his desire to consider extending Provost Ginsberg’s term from his current 2-year term to the more customary 5-year term. He asked the Senate Executive Committee to lead an evaluation committee. In accordance with Section 1.2.5 of the Faculty Handbook, the Executive Committee put out a call for elected faculty representatives. Two faculty from the nominees were elected by the general faculty: Bethany Letiecq (CEHD) and Mohan Venigalla (CEC). The committee also asked for a Staff Senate representative to the committee; Anthony DiMaio will serve. The committee will be chaired by Solon Simmons, Chair of the Faculty Matters Committee. The floor was given to Senator Simmons for more information.

- Senator Simmons reviewed Section 1.2.5 of the Handbook, noting that the committee would follow this section. Thus, there will be an opportunity to meet with the Provost in a public forum and to provide feedback on that, and there will be multiple ways for the community to provide input more broadly. He noted that the Faculty Evaluation of Administrators (FEA) would also be used, and encouraged everyone to fill it out. He noted that FEA response rate overall was 32% at this point, ranging from 60% in the College of Health and Human Services and 58% in the Carter School to 8% in the Law School (other units were between 19% and 39%).

Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden, Chair

- There has been extensive review of the university catalog, due to ongoing SACS Reaffirmation. Jesse Guessford (Director of Curriculum and Initiatives, Undergraduate Education) suggested revisions to Catalog AP 2.5.4 (termination from major) to add the possibility of termination from a specific concentration within a major (not just from a major), so that units may choose to terminate a student from a concentration, but not from the entire major field. The AP committee moved that the Senate approve the revisions shown in Appendix A. There was no discussion from the floor, and the motion carried with unanimous approval.

Budget and Resource – Kumar Mehta, Co-Chair

- No report

Faculty Matters – Solon Simmons, Chair

- No report beyond earlier discussion about Provost Review Committee and FEA

Nominations – Charlotte Gill, Co-Chair

- Senator Gill thanked all who nominated themselves and who voted in the elections for the Task Force on Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards and the Provost Review Committee. Chair Brockelman-Post already announced those elected to the Provost Review Committee. The nominees elected to the Task Force were: Laura Poms (CHHS) and Sara Mathis (CHSS) for the two term faculty positions, and Esperanza Roman-Mendoza (CHSS) and Courtney Wooten (CHSS) for the two tenure-line faculty positions. Two Faculty Senators (one term,
one tenure-line) are also needed. Nominations received nominees in response to an email call, and additional nominees may be made from the floor today. Senator Gill noted that the task force required representatives from eight colleges/schools, and specifically encouraged Senators from colleges/schools not yet represented.

- Current members were reviewed: Melissa Broeckelman-Post (CHSS-COMM), Laura Poms (CHHS – GCH), Sara Mathis (CHSS-COMM), Esperanza Roman-Mendoza (CHSS-MCL), Courtney Adams Wooten (CHSS – ENGL). Nominees from Faculty Senate were:
  - Term: Daniel Garrison (CEC – Information Sciences and Technology), Rebecca Sutter (CHHS – Nursing)
  - Tenure-line: Lisa Billingham (CVPA – MUS), Tim Gibson (CHSS – COMM), Tom Wood (CHSS – School of Integrative Studies)

- Nominees made brief statements. Chair Broeckelman-Post reminded everyone that the Task Force must have at least eight colleges or schools represented, and with the first 5 members, only two were represented (CHSS and CHHS), with two already from the same department. After today, 5 more members will be appointed by the Senate Executive Committee, so at least one new college or school must be represented today in the election to even be able to get to a total of 8 different colleges/schools.

- Ballot was done via Qualtrics (with email authentication). Lisa Billingham (CVPA-MUS) was elected to serve as tenure line Faculty Senator, and Daniel Garrison (CEC-IST) was elected to serve as term Faculty Senator.

**Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham, Chair**

- An update to the charge for the Athletic Council was made (shown in Appendix B). There was no discussion from the floor, and the motion carried unanimously.
- Senator Billingham also reminded faculty that the second Ombuds candidate would be on campus for interviews and a forum on Monday, September 27th. She indicated that she hoped to have an announcement of who would move into the position within the next month or so.
- Senator Billingham also asked for members of various committees to reach out with any potential changes to committee charges.

**B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives**

**Gift Acceptance Committee**

- Annual Report 2020-21 submitted (Link to report)

**Effective Teaching Committee – Tom Wood, Chair**

- Senator Wood reminded Senators that revisions to the student evaluation of teaching (SET) form had already been approved after a pilot, but that it had not yet been implemented, due to COVID and a switch to the online evaluation system “Blue.” Blue is now up and functioning, and Mason has hopefully transitioned past the worst part of COVID. Thus, on behalf of the Effective Teaching Committee, Senator Wood moved that the current SET form be replaced with the modified form shown in Appendix C, beginning in the Spring of 2022. The motion was seconded.
- A senator asked why there was no follow-through on the initial plan for a second pilot. Senator Wood replied that the committee felt there was little to be gained by an additional pilot.
• Additional discussion involved questions about (a) whether the new form would encourage better response rates, (b) whether the new form would address the well-established bias that has been documented in SET forms in general, (c) the reasons for removing “overall teaching” and “overall course” questions from the form, (d) the use of means for item responses that may not reflect interval data, and (e) whether some redundancy still remained among the proposed questions. It was acknowledged that further work was needed to improve response rates (allowing time during synchronous classes was noted as the best strategy identified to date), and it was discussed that the new form would hopefully help reduce some of the bias inherent in SETs, particularly by the removal of the “overall” questions, which demonstrate the strongest susceptibility to bias in most research. It was noted that Blue provides medians, although they may be difficult to find. It was also noted that evaluation of issues like redundancy would continue in coming semesters. Finally, it was stressed that we need more ways of evaluating teaching beyond SETs (e.g., peer review).

• Subsequent discussion acknowledged that there could still be further improvements in both the form and the overall process of evaluation of teaching, but that the proposed changes represent a step in the right direction, after many years of work by the committee.

• After discussion concluded, the motion passed by voice vote.

Master Plan Steering Committee – Zachary Schrag, FS Representative
• Update report submitted (see Appendix D)

V. New Business
  • No new business brought to the floor.

VI. Announcements
  • Provost Ginsberg made remarks.
    o He noted feeling honored that President Washington has asked me to consider remaining in this position for additional amount of time and looked forward to conversing with faculty and staff and receiving feedback.
    o He reported that, after drop/add period ended, enrollment was roughly the same as record enrollment we had in Fall 2020 – down only slightly (0.3%). There are fiscal implications, but they will not be significant. Overall, around 67% of undergraduate class sections and 76% of graduate class sections are fully or predominantly face-to-face (FTF). He expressed hope that the spring would be similar.
    o He reported that the university is embarking on searches for five Dean positions: two new “Divisional Dean” positions in College of Engineering and Computing, Dean of School of Business (Maury Peiperl is stepping down at end of this year), Dean of College of Health and Human Services (Germaine Louis is retiring at end of this year), and Dean of College of Education and Human Development (whenever Provost Ginsberg concludes work as provost, he will return to CEHD as faculty, not dean). Each of the search committees will be comprised predominantly of faculty members from the unit, including at least one Faculty Senator from each unit.
    o He reported on a task force focused on behavioral health of students, faculty, and staff. Task force includes leaders in these areas across campus, and they have formed a proposal to increase resources and investment in behavioral health and well-being at the university. The proposal is being considered later this week.
    o There are several other initiatives that are continuing. Safe Return to Campus Plan continues to be the top priority (and continues to be highly successful, with a
positive test rate less than 0.5%). Strategic planning, leveraging the work of the Innovation Commission from last year, will begin soon. Ken Walsh, Chief of Staff, will brief the Faculty Senate about that at regular intervals. The Task Force for Reimagining Faculty Roles and Rewards is getting underway. President Washington has been talking extensively about the new Virginia Promise and elevating the work that we do for the success of all students – traditional and nontraditional, degree seeking and non-degree, in credit bearing and non-credit bearing courses – to help the Commonwealth continue to become a successful, well-educated state. The Branding Initiative and Campus Master Plan are also proceeding. Finally, the university will be focusing on ways to rise in rankings and on beginning the next capital fundraising campaign.

- No other announcements were made.

VII. Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty

- Senator Schrag noted that the master plan report holds a lot of information and invited faculty to reach out with any questions.
- Chair Broeckelman-Post noted no need for the spillover meeting, so that time will be used for the next Executive Committee meeting.

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 4:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Keith Renshaw
Secretary
Approval of change to catalog policy
The current policy concerns only termination from the major. However, the local academic unit may choose to terminate a student from a concentration within the major and not from the entire major field.

Proposed changes to the policy are shown in strikeout (deleted) or underlined (insertion) font.

AP.5.2.4 Termination from the Concentration or Major

Undergraduate students in any retention category may be reviewed for possible termination by their dean according to the published policy approved by the major program. Termination from a major—or from all majors in a college—Termination from a concentration, a major, or from all majors in a college may be imposed as a result of excessive repeating of required courses without achieving the minimum standard, and for other evidence of continued failure to make adequate progress toward completion of the concentration or major. Students must be informed notified a semester in advance of their possible termination and given a chance to meet the standard or to appeal according to published college/school procedures. Once a termination decision has been made, a letter of termination is sent to the student by the dean and notification of termination from the concentration or major is affixed to the student's academic record. Students who are terminated are no longer eligible to pursue that concentration or major, but may declare a different concentration or major within the university to complete their undergraduate degree.

-----------------------------------------------------------------------

Background

AP.4.2.1 Definitions of Degree Components

• Degree program, major, or field: A program of study that normally requires at least 30 credits of coursework in the specified field. The primary program name (degree and major or field) appears on the diploma for bachelor's and master's degrees. Only the degree name appears for doctoral degrees. An undergraduate who desires to graduate with a BA or BS degree in two or more subjects must meet departmental requirements for the major in each field. For each major, at least 18 credits used to fulfill its requirements must be applied only to that major, i.e., cannot be used to fulfill the requirements of a concentration, minor, undergraduate certificate, or another major.

• Concentration: A second-order component of a degree program. A concentration consists of at least 12 hours that are not applied to any other concentration. Undergraduate concentrations are approved by the Undergraduate Council at the undergraduate level or by the Graduate Council at the graduate level.
Appendix B
Organization and Operations

Updated Charge for the Athletic Council

Current charge:

To act in an advisory capacity to the Vice President for Student Affairs in all matters pertaining to intercollegiate and intramural athletics.

Change to:

To act in an advisory capacity to the President in all matters pertaining to Intercollegiate athletics. The Council provides general review of the policies and operations of the University’s athletic program with primary focus on academic integrity and student-athletes well-being. The Council provides the opportunity to involve faculty, administration, students, and other concerned groups of the University. The Council assists with educating the university community about intercollegiate athletics.

This has previously been approved by the Athletic Council.
Appendix C  
Recommended Revisions to the Course Evaluation Form (submitted by the Effective Teaching Committee)  

Attachment A  

George Mason University  
Course Evaluation Form  

Course Title (e.g., HIST 101 001) ____________________ Instructor’s Name ____________________  

Student Information  
1) What is your class level?  
2) For your plan of study, this course is:  
3) What is the class format/delivery?  
4) How many times were you absent from class sessions?  
5) On average, how many hours per week outside of class did you spend preparing for this class?  
6) What grade do you expect in this course?  

Please thoughtfully consider the following statements and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>N/A or Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed all assigned tasks before each class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I consistently contributed to class activities/discussions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I gained an understanding of the main concepts in this course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I learned through the variety of learning opportunities (e.g. assignments, projects, papers, discussions, group work, peer review, exams) provided.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) I found the instructor’s feedback helpful for learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) I learned due to the instructor’s teaching methods/style.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) The instructor created an environment that facilitated my engagement with course content.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) The instructor encouraged expression of diverse perspectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) The instructor offered opportunities for students to provide feedback on the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) The instructor offered opportunities to meet outside of class time, such as virtual or in-person office hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) The instructor used technologies and/or resources/tools that increased my engagement with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instructor Preparation and Course Organization

18) The course organization supported my learning.  
19) The instructor clearly communicated course requirements to students.  
20) The instructor clearly presented the course content.

Please respond to the following questions

1) Were there any significant obstacles to learning that were beyond the control of the instructor (e.g., scheduling or technology problems, university closings, limitations caused by other students or by group dynamics)? If so, please explain.

2) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were most valuable to your learning experience?
   •
   •
   •

3) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were least valuable to your learning experience?
   •
   •
   •

4) What modifications do you suggest for the next time the course is taught?

Thank you for your feedback!
**SAMPLE ITEMS FACULTY MAY CHOOSE TO ADD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Use</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Navigation throughout the online components of the course was appropriate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the complexity of the course.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The course directed students to technology resources to help them succeed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in an online learning environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) To what extent did the technology used in this course (e.g., Blackboard,  
synchronous learning, discussion board, Wikis) facilitate your learning?

Revised February 21, 2019
The Faculty Senate members of the Master Plan Steering Committee offer the following report on the Master Plan process.

Phase 1

Phase 1 of the Master Plan process ended in April 2021 with the release of the Master Plan Phase One Progress Report, available at University Master Plan | Construction at Mason. As that report explains, the goal of Phase 1 was "to collect and analyze relevant data, both hard and soft, so as to provide the university with an accurate accounting of the state of the institution from a physical planning perspective. The broader strategic goal is to establish a data-informed programmatic identity for each of the three primary campuses so that the more detailed physical planning work of Phase Two is purposefully guided by a larger vision."

The Faculty Senate members’ comments on the draft of that report were included with the April 28, 2021 agenda and can be read at https://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/2021-04-21%20Faculty%20Senate%20representatives%20draft%20comments%20on%20Master%20Plan%20phase%20one%20report.pdf

Our concerns about transportation and workspace issues are being addressed in Phase 2 of process. Other questions have yet to be addressed.

A summary of our concerns about the Phase 1 report can be found at the end of this document.

Phase 2

Phase 2 began in April 2021 and is planned to be completed in fall 2021. According to the Master Plan website, it is designed to "focus on more detailed planning for the highest value scenarios, including: Mobility, Infrastructure, Sustainability, Potential new buildings, Renovations, Open spaces, and Other, as identified in Phase One."

The Faculty Senate representatives identified two areas of particular concern to faculty: mobility and workspace design.

Mobility

On September 3, 2021, we sent a list of questions about the transportation proposals that we hope will be answered as part of the Phase Two report. We append those questions here.

Three of the boldest ideas emerging from Phase Two of the master planning process concern mobility:

- Shift a great deal of Fairfax parking to a remote lot West Campus, connected by shuttle to the academic core
- Reshape Patriot Circle into separate north-south and east-west streets
- Develop the campus’s stream corridors into a linear park with some kind of path.

All of these ideas have great potential to serve the university's goals of sustainability, well-being, campus life, and fiscal responsibility. They also could beautify the campus and make it a thriving place to live and work. But they also bring risks, if they make travel to campus so inconvenient that employees and students avoid it, or if they fail to provide the through routes for active transportation that would meet plan goals.

We pose the following questions in hopes of clarifying the planners’ intentions and better understanding how they seek to achieve their goals.

What are the goals and criteria of a mobility plan for the Mason campuses?

We can imagine several possible goals for a mobility plan, based on previous Mason statements and Greg’s explanations so far. We would like to see an explicit statement of the goals for a transportation system. How should the university prioritize or weight the following?
• Maintain the ability for students, staff, and faculty to get to their classrooms and workspaces in a reasonable amount of time after their arrival on campus.
• Increase land available for non-parking functions, including academic buildings, student life, residences, dining and shopping.
• Reduce the fiscal burden of parking and Mason’s carbon footprint by avoiding expensive, concrete decks
• Meet sustainability goals by encouraging travel by means other than single-occupant automobiles.
• Accommodate multiple modes of transportation while reducing conflict among them.
• Contribute to the well-being of students, staff, and faculty by providing options for active transportation.

How can we encourage alternative transportation choices without denying access to campus?

The toughest tension in the above goals may be the wish to reduce the use of single-occupant automobiles without making access to campus prohibitively difficult to those who do not have other good choices. To resolve this tension, we might seek to encourage people who live closer to campus to use other methods, while expecting those who already have long commutes or tight schedules to continue driving alone. Can a mix of incentives, fees, and built infrastructure differentiate between those whom we want to discourage from driving, and those whose driving the university accepts as necessary?

What was the pre-pandemic status quo?

The Phase One report stated that “In general, parking is not perceived as a major challenge for the [Fairfax] campus.” As the Faculty Senate members stated in our Phase One comments, this does not accord with what we’ve heard from students and adjunct faculty, many of whom arrive at campus later in the day, when the garages and lots are full or nearly so.

By contrast, full-time faculty and staff are more likely to arrive in the morning and have the option to pay for lots and decks reserved for faculty and staff. They can, if they were willing to pay, often find parking that is less than a ten-minute walk to their offices.

What data does Mason have about the time it took—before the pandemic—for students, faculty and staff, and visitors to find a parking space and then get to their destinations on campus? What proportion of university members used alternative means to come to campus? What proportion could have used alternatives?

What is an acceptable time to destination?

Remote parking, such as that proposed for West Campus, can be time consuming. For example, UNC Greensboro advises students using its Park & Ride lot to budget up to 30 minutes from finding a parking spot to arriving at their classroom: "catch the next bus (10 minutes max), travel to the bus stop closest to your building (10 minutes max), and walk to your building (10 minutes max)." It suggests that “Once you develop a routine for the semester, less time will likely be sufficient," but it is not clear how a routine would shave time off of any of those intervals. And buses run less frequently in the evening.

Would Mason students, staff, faculty, and visitors also need to budget 30 minutes to get from their car in a West Campus lot to their destination? Or could direct shuttle service along campus drive cut both the headways and the time on the shuttle to below the 10 minutes required by UNC Greensboro buses? Could graduate students and faculty—whose courses often run until 10pm—be guaranteed frequent shuttle service?

What other specific metrics would constitute a successful mobility plan?

Beyond time to destination, how else might we set specific metrics with which to design a plan now and assess its success in the future?

Parking economist Donald Shoup has suggested that the optimal level of parking-lot occupancy is about 85 percent: enough vehicles to show that the lot is meeting a demand, but with enough empty spots that drivers do not waste time cruising. Is this the right target for lots and garages at Mason? How does that compare to pre-pandemic levels of occupancy?

What are the costs of remote parking? What are the alternatives?
Presumably a remote-parking plan would rely on frequent shuttle service throughout the day. What is the cost of such service, in terms of vehicles, fuel, wages, and environmental pollution? How might these costs be mitigated by new technologies, such as the autonomous electric vehicles tested by Fairfax County? Are there other parking improvements to consider? For example, are there ways to increase efficiency in finding parking spots, perhaps similar to the parking counters and red/green lights indicating occupied/vacant parking spots in use in some area parking garages?

How could Mason provide alternatives to driving alone?

Mason already provides some incentives, in the form of cash payments, transit benefits, and reserved spaces, for students and employees who come to campus by bicycle, public transit, carpool, or vanpool. How have these incentives worked, and how might they be expanded? Could infrastructure changes, both on and off campus, improve the use of bicycle, scooter, and transit options?

Other universities have announced plans to promote alternative transportation. The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, seeks to recognize bicycling “as a fundamental component of how UNC-CH functions” and to coordinate campus plans with those of the surrounding city and state. The University of Texas plan states that “The University of Texas at Austin has both an opportunity and an imperative to become a great cycling campus.” The University of Colorado at Boulder “Strive[s] to maintain [its campus] as a primarily pedestrian zone while providing opportunities for bicycle and skateboard riders to get across campus without a lot of interaction with pedestrians.”

Could Mason’s Fairfax campus aim for comparable goals? How do current plans for Patriot Circle and the Necklace fit into a broader plan to promote active transportation? Are there other infrastructure elements (e.g., shower access and bike racks) that would also need to be incorporated?

How have other institutions addressed these challenges?

In his remarks to both the Master Plan Steering Committee and the engagement session, Greg Janks mentioned that other research universities—located in metropolitan areas—are relying more on remote parking, but he did not identify any. Which universities have succeeded with moving parking from the core to remote lots? Which have succeeded in promoting alternatives to single-occupant automobiles? How have they defined success—by the reduction in congestion, the availability of parking lots for other uses, by user satisfaction, or some other metric?

And to what degree are Mason’s challenges unusual or unique, given its suburban location within a major metropolitan area?

Workspace

At the kind invitation of Facilities staff, we invited all members of the Faculty Senate and the Adjunct Faculty Committee to a meeting with staff and consultants concerning faculty workspaces.

On September 14, consultant Gregory Janks, other Dumont Janks staff, and university staff met with twenty-seven faculty members, including tenure-line, term, and adjunct faculty. Faculty expressed the importance of private offices for full-time faculty for teaching, research, and student advising. They emphasized that without welcoming offices, faculty would be less likely to come to campus to participate in campus events, and that departments would have trouble recruiting prospective faculty in competition with other universities. They cautioned against relying on faculty to be able to work from home, given that faculty have varied living conditions and family responsibilities. Many university activities rely on faculty's having offices, and we don’t know how many would break without them.

Faculty did acknowledge the diversity of experience with office space. Some faculty use their offices rarely, and the need for an office does not always track one’s rank or title. They note that while we can’t expect every adjunct to have a private office, it is possible to provide space for adjuncts to work in private and to meet with students in private.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Dr. Janks noted, “I can assure you again the Master Plan is not going to come down one way or the other and say this is the only way things should be. It will definitely have to say that solutions need to be nuanced and based on the specific user groups, and then begin to describe the range of factors in play. Some of them you won’t like, with some of these prioritization questions and some of these questions about 7% this, 40% this. I think those are reasonable things to put on the table, although I certainly accept that that there are different views on that. I also think we want to represent the
need for deep thought, the need to meet with students, the need for privacy, the FERPA issues, and then, and then, amongst other things, this issue that you put on this table of having function be the guide. Our role here is to really try to highlight as many of these issues as possible and not come up with a single solution.”

Summary of Concerns about Phase One Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate Concern</th>
<th>Phase One Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Need for a Statement of Principles</td>
<td>No principles articulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consultations</td>
<td>No report on feedback from town hall meetings, or report of attendance at meetings with units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A “primarily graduate campus”</td>
<td>No explanation of how that would work, or examples of other universities that have adopted that model for a campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of a potential medical school</td>
<td>No explanation of why SciTech is the only location being considered for a medical school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A research park at SciTech</td>
<td>No definition of a research park, and how that would be different from an innovation district. Unclear if the term “research park” is used as defined by the Association of University Research Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Town Center</td>
<td>Unclear if success of Innovation Town Center depends on any particular number of students, faculty, and staff at SciTech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Continuing education&quot; in computing</td>
<td>Report revised to state that “Continuing Education will maintain their primary location at Arlington, but will also maintain multiple locations based on existing operations, including provisions to expand into SciTech.” Unclear how that affects the need for space at SciTech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic VIII</td>
<td>No discussion of how master plan process will effect plans for Academic VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciTech’s effects on other campuses</td>
<td>No discussion of how relocation of programs from SciTech will affect other campuses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty workspaces</td>
<td>No explanation of why Dumont Janks is considering office sizes below what Mason planners have previously considered the minimum to meet ADA requirements, or how smaller offices might affect needs for additional common spaces. More discussion is continuing in Phase 2, including the September 14 meeting with faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Phase 1 final report retains the statement that “parking is not perceived as a major challenge for the campus,” which seems at odds with Faculty Senate report and Town Hall comments. No discussion of barriers to bicycling. We expect more discussion of this in Phase 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
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Visitors present: Anu Aneja (Director, Women and Gender Studies), Ashley Archer (Assessment and Survey Coordinator, OIEP), Mary Bramley (Director, Donor Relations and Stewardship, University Advancement and Alumni Relations) Carlos Chism (Term Assistant Professor, English), Shannon Davis (Associate Dean, GMU Korea), Kathleen Diemer (Associate Vice President, Advancement Relations), Kimberly Dight (Executive Director, Finance and Human Resources, College of Humanities and Social Sciences), Fatou Diouf (Assistant Professor, Info Systems and Operations Management, School of Business), Kim Eby (Associate Provost, Faculty Affairs and Development), Kimberly Ford (Director of Personnel Operations/Academic Administration and Operations/Office of the Provost), Kenneth Foreman (Associate Professor, Chemistry and Biochemistry), Isaac Gang (Associate Professor, CEC, DAEN), Brooke Gowl (Associate Director of Research Development, Dean's Office, College of Humanities and Social Sciences) Rector Jimmy Hazel, Jo Ann Henson (University Libraries), Molli Herth (Program Manager, Faculty Affairs and Development, Office of the Provost), Caitlin Horan (Assistant Dean, Graduate Academic Services / School of Business), Virginia Hoy (Term Asst Professor, English & BIS), Seth Hudson (Associate Professor, Computer Game Design, CVPA), Michael Hunter (Resource Sharing Librarian) Erin Iacangelo (SciTech Event Coordinator, Chair, Staff Senate), Tim Leslie (Associate Professor, Geography and Geoinformation Science), Jaime Lester (Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs, Strategic Initiatives, College of Humanities and Social Sciences), Lance Liotta (Chair, Faculty Senate Research Advisory Committee) Kimberly MacVaugh (Librarians' Council Vice-Chair), Itamar Lochard (Director, Cyber Policy Studies, CARE, Volgenau School of Engineering), Christopher Magee (Social Sciences Librarian / Librarian / University Libraries), Karen Manley (Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning), Dhafer Marzougui (Associate Professor, Physics and Astronomy), Doug McKenna (University Registrar), Janette Muir (Vice Provost, Academic Affairs), Cheryl Oetjen (Interim Director, School of Nursing), Eunkyoung Park (Director of Co-Curricular Assessment, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning), Cindy Parker (Term Associate Professor), Cathy Pinksey (Capital Program Director, Facilities), Shelley Reid (Stearns Center), Marguerite Rippy (Associate Dean, CHSS), Deborah
Sanchez (Term Assistant Professor, English Language, INTO), Sheena Serslev (Associate Director, Institutional Assessment, OIEP), Pam Shepherd (Communications Director, Office of the Provost), Matthew Smith (Director of Accreditation/Office of the Provost), Jasmine Spitler (Assessment Librarian/University Libraries), Frank Strike (VP, Facilities), Darren Troxler (Associate Dean of Admissions and Strategic Initiatives), Girum Urgessa (Associate Professor/CEIE), Bethany Usher (Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education), Preston Williams (Presidential Communications Manager, Office of Communications), James Willis (Professor and Chair, Criminology, Law and Society), Elizabeth Woodley (University Ethics Officer, Institutional Compliance), Courtney Wooten (Director of Composition and Assistant Professor/English), Lijun Zhang (Assistant Professor, Folklore Studies Program, English).